

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO : 1798 of 2005

Between:

D. Prameela Devi, w/o. D.K. M. Gupta,
D.No.3-29-17/4, 2/2 Krishna Nagar, Guntur, Guntur District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

- 1 Additional Director Generald of Police, Central Bureau of Criminal Investigation
Dept., Saifabad, Hyderabad.
- 2 Deputy Superintendent of Police, CBCID, Vijayawada.
- 3 State of A.P., rep. by its Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat Hyderabad.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to Issue a writ order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus (a) to direct the first and second respondents to not to harass this petitioner by threatening to arrest her basing on the complaints of the individuals as their complaints were considered in the investigation completed by the 1st and 2nd respondents (b) to declare this petitioner is not liable for the allegations against Vijetha Agrofarms as the alleged transactions were not taken place by that time this petitioner is not the director for the company.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.S.SATYANARAYANA MOORTHY

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME

The Court at the admission stage made the following :

ORDER:

The petitioner seeks a writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents viz., the Additional Director General of Police, CBCID, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, CBCID, and the Secretary, State of A.P., Home Department, not to harass her by threatening to arrest, on the basis of complaints of various individuals. It is stated that the petitioner, at one point of time, was associated with a company by name Vijetha Agro Farms India Limited and since the depositors in the said Company made complaints about non-payment of the amount, several cases have been registered. In some cases, the charge sheets are also said to have been filed.

The petitioner contends that there are about 50,000 depositors/shareholders and on the strength of each complaint, proceedings are initiated and she is being subjected to undue hardship.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Home.

The relief claimed by the petitioner is too vague and general in nature. The allegations or the complaints made against her, if any, are to be dealt with on their own merits. A general direction in the form sought for by the petitioner cannot be issued. The grievance of each complainant has its own ramifications and this Court cannot issue any general directions as to the clubbing of the complaints or cannot decide the nature of the investigation or trial to be taken on such complaints. If the petitioner feels aggrieved about the action taken on the basis of any complaint, she can certainly canvass the same before appropriate Forum.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

16.02.2005

Jsu
To

- 1 Additional Director Generald of Police, Central Bureau of Criminal Investigation Dept., Saifabad, Hyderabad.
- 2 Deputy Superintendent of Police, CBCID, Vijayawada.
- 3 State of A.P., rep. by its Secretary, Home Department, Secretariat Hyderabad.

4 2 CCs to the G.P. for Home, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad. (OUT)

5 2 CD copies

